

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Adrian Johnson,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

Maningo Law, *et al.*,

Defendant(s).

2:24-cv-00827-RFB-MDC

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION**

Pending before the Court is *pro se* plaintiff Adrian Johnson's *Motion to Stay Proceedings* ("Motion") (ECF No. 10). For the reasons stated below, the Court GRANTS the Motion IN PART.

Upon review of the Motion, plaintiff seems to assert that additional time is needed to comply with the Court's Order (ECF No. 9). *See Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94, 127 S. Ct. 2197, 167 L. Ed. 2d 1081 (2007) ("A document filed *pro se* is 'to be liberally construed[.]'"). The Court previously granted plaintiff an extension and ordered him to file his IFP application by September 10, 2024. ECF No. 9. On September 6, 2024, plaintiff filed the present Motion (ECF No. 10), asserting that he is having some difficulty obtaining the required documents. For good cause shown, the Court GRANTS the Motion IN PART.

ACCORDINGLY,

**IT IS ORDERED that:**

1. The Motion (ECF No. 10) is GRANTED IN PART.
2. Plaintiff must file his IFP application by **November 22, 2024**; however, the Court will not grant a stay of the proceedings at this time.

DATED this 25<sup>th</sup> day of September 2024.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

  
Hon. Maximiliano D. Couvillier III  
United States Magistrate Judge

**NOTICE**

Pursuant to Local Rules IB 3-1 and IB 3-2, a party may object to orders and reports and recommendations issued by the magistrate judge. Objections must be in writing and filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen days. LR IB 3-1, 3-2. The Supreme Court has held that the courts of appeal may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the specified time. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985).

This circuit has also held that (1) failure to file objections within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and brief the objectionable issues waives the right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal factual issues from the order of the District Court. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991); *Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). Pursuant to LR IA 3-1, the plaintiff must immediately file written notification with the court of any change of address. The notification must include proof of service upon each opposing party's attorney, or upon the opposing party if the party is unrepresented by counsel. Failure to comply with this rule may result in dismissal of the action.